

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

TIMBERLY HUGHES,

Defendant.

Case No. [18-cv-05931-JCS](#)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART
DENYING IN PART DISCOVERY
LETTER**

Re: Dkt. No. 113


The parties have filed yet another joint letter (the “Motion”). As with some of the previous motions, it was made necessary by defendant’s lack of understanding of her discovery obligations.

The Motion is **GRANTED IN PART** as follows:

1. Defendant is ordered to answer interrogatory #8 in full under oath within ten (10) days of this Order. This question is relevant to the issue of willfulness. Defendant’s only objection in her responses is that the discovery is not relevant and is post judgment discovery. Neither objection has any merit. If defendant used tax return software which alerted her as to her possible obligations to file the reports at issue in this case, use of that software would be relevant to willfulness. In her portion of the joint letter Defendant argues that this interrogatory has been asked and answered. It has not.
2. Defendant is ordered to file, within ten (10) days of today, a declaration under oath detailing all steps she has taken to find copies of all instructions or summaries provided to her by any tax preparation software she used during the years at issue.
3. Plaintiff’s request to extend the discovery cutoff is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 22, 2021


JOSEPH C. SPERO
Chief Magistrate Judge